

## REMARKS

### Remarks as It regards to the Office Action Date from August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

5 Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Specification Remarks

On February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007, the Examiner requested that the applicant correct the  
10 Cross Reference to Related Patent and Continuing Data from Bib Data Sheet  
with the same information.

Then the Examiner consulted with a Legal Instrument Examiner on June 4<sup>th</sup>,  
2007 about an original of Bib Data Sheet information as "371 of PCT/US02/39275  
15 filed on 12/07/2002" that is CORRECTED and it will be remained in the  
application, applicant does NOT need to correct anything. Therefore,  
amendment to continuing data from BIB DATA SHEET filed on 5/21/2007 as  
suggested by Examiner was NOT corrected which must be deleted or canceled  
as "This International application is relate A to the following US Application  
20 09/632,320 PAT 6,492,897 which was filed on August 4, 2000. This application  
is a 371 of PCT/US02/39275 12/07/200."

On August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007, the Examiner objected to the Specification filed on  
7/26/2007 because it was unclear (missing words) on first line. The Examiner  
25 asked that the Application provide & resubmit a clear & better Specification.

The Applicant clearly and exactly followed the Examiner's request on June 4<sup>th</sup>,  
2007 by exactly requesting a deletion of the words that was added on February  
8<sup>th</sup>, 2007. The exact words were provided by the Examiner.  
30

Therefore, to provide a clear resolution of this misunderstanding, the Applicant  
has requested that the Examiner review the history of this request. The Applicant

would like to revert back to the original submission for the BIB DATA SHEET. This was the intention of the last submission as requested by the Examiner.

**Claim Remarks**

5 The Examiner has rejected the Amendment on August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007 under 37 U.S.C. §112.

The Examiner rejects claim 1 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches a technique of system for handoff 10 comprising tethered or untethered device with power line communication to a street light.

Although the Applicant believes that Claim 1 was clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner, the claim has been modified in order to clarify 15 the invention in this respect.

The Applicant has added the word *wireless* to Claim 1 so as to clearly define the communication method over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894). This Application (10/519,912) specifically teaches that you must have wireless communication 20 circuitry for the handoff, and powerline communication circuitry is optional. However, Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches you must have both powerline communication and wireless communication [col. 13, lines 1-9, Claim 1g, Claim 5, Claim 9, Abstract] The Applicant also wants to point out that this is not new material and is specifically referenced in the original application. [Page 11 - lines 25 20-21, Page 11 – lines 22-27, Page 15 – lines 15-22, Page 15 - lines 21-27, Claim 23 and Claim 26]

The Examiner rejects claim 6 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff including 30 communication network which multi sites of users can be communicated by radio frequency signal/wireless.

In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 6 is now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner. Also, Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) does not teach mesh networks. Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) only teaches of a wireless bridge. [col. 7, lines 26-32, col. 11, lines 9-5 11, col. 11, lines 20-22, col. 13, lines 1-9, Claim 5] One skilled in the art would recognize that wireless bridges are not the same as mesh networks.

The Examiner rejects claim 7 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff including 10 signal power and evaluating data.

In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 7 is now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner.

15 The Examiner rejects 8-9 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff including a photo detector socket/ light socket, communicates using wireless, infrared, laser and so on.

20 In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 8-9 are now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejects 10 & 12-14 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff 25 including communication network which multi sites of users can be communicated by radio frequency/signal/wireless and the power line communication with an integrated circuit and real time.

In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 1, the Applicant believes that 30 Claim 10 & 12-14 are now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejects claim 23 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches a technique of system for handoff comprising tethered or untethered device with power line communication to a street light.

5

Although the Applicant believes that Claim 23 was clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner, the claim has been modified in order to clarify the invention in this respect. The Applicant would like to note that the communication circuitry for Claim 23 was not referenced as power line communication circuitry. This definition of communication circuitry was accomplished in Claim 26.

10 The Applicant has added the word *wireless* to Claim 23 so as to clearly define the communication method over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894). This Application (10/519,912) specifically teaches that you must have wireless communication circuitry for the handoff, and powerline communication circuitry is optional. However, Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches you must have both powerline communication and wireless communication [col. 13, lines 1-9, Claim 1g, Claim 5, Claim 9, Abstract] The Applicant also wants to point out that this is not new material and is specifically referenced in the original application. [Page 11 - lines 20-21, Page 11 – lines 22-27, Page 15 – lines 15-22, Page 15 - lines 21-27, Claim 23 and Claim 26]

15 The Examiner rejects 24-26 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff including a photo detector/light socket, communicates using wireless, infrared, laser and so on.

20 In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 23, the Applicant believes that Claims 24-26 are now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner. Also, Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) does not teach mesh networks. Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) only teaches of a wireless bridge. [col. 7, lines 26-

32, col. 11, lines 9-11, col. 11, lines 20-22, col. 13, lines 1-9, Claim 5] One skilled in the art would recognize that wireless bridges are not the same as mesh networks.

- 5 The Examiner rejects 27-28 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) teaches the system for handoff including communication network which multi sites of users can be communicate by radio frequency signal/wireless.
- 10 In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 23, the Applicant believes that Claims 27-28 are now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes the Application, as amended, is in condition  
15 for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

20   
Dr. Richard A. Mowery, Jr.

(254) 848-9932